



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FAILURE OF THE HUMBLE PETITION AND ADVICE¹

SINCE a compromise never meets the wishes of any considerable party, it must justify itself by its success in securing the objects desired by its supporters. If the Humble Petition and Advice actually brought "settlement" to the nation, even those who were originally discontented with it would soon give in their adhesion. On the other hand, if it failed in securing this desirable end, all these lukewarm supporters would soon be active opponents of the new government.

In case the Humble Petition and Advice did succeed, then the opinion that the cause of civil government had won a considerable victory would be justified. It soon became apparent, however, that success could not yet be claimed, but that another trial of strength must be made between the army and the sectaries on the one hand, and the staunch upholders of the Humble Petition and Advice on the other. All the supporters of kingship could by no means be counted among the adherents of the new government, since many of them were irrevocably hostile to any government which did not include monarchy; while others, probably more numerous still, were at the best only lukewarm in support. It is true that the compromise had, for the time being, secured the support of Desborough and Fleetwood. But their adherence was of little moment unless they could carry with them a considerable party. It is doubtful, however, if Desborough had any following of importance; while Fleetwood could not possibly secure the allegiance of the larger number of the sectaries, some of whom already reproached

¹ This paper forms the concluding portion of an independent study of the last attempts to settle the government under Cromwell. The two preceding portions related to the failure of the Instrument of Government and to the Humble Petition and Advice and the attempt to make Cromwell king. But while they were receiving their final preparation for the press, there appeared successively Mr. C. H. Firth's two articles in the *English Historical Review* (XVII. 429, July, 1902, and XVIII. 52, January, 1903) on "Cromwell and the Crown," and the first chapter of Mr. Gardiner's fourth volume. These cover so nearly the same ground as the papers described that I do not deem it expedient or useful to print them, though a mention of them seems almost necessary toward explaining the existence and the limits of the present paper.

him with being recreant to the "Good Old Cause."¹ Their support, therefore, could have been of no great moment, and they were determined that no further change should take place.

In this attitude they would be supported by the sectarian party, which had always been fostered by Fleetwood and which still exercised vast influence over the Protector. "That gang," as Henry Cromwell stigmatized it, would certainly hinder settlement. Apparently they feared that kingship had only been deferred, especially since the Humble Petition and Advice, as finally adopted, retained the "other house," or House of Lords. They omitted no opportunity, therefore, of putting difficulties in the way of further change. Many of the soldiers in England thanked Cromwell for his refusal of the title; and attempts were made to secure from some of the Irish officers similar congratulations, apparently without Henry Cromwell's knowledge, though perhaps with that of Fleetwood, who was still lord deputy.²

The irreconcilability of interests is vividly portrayed in a letter of Richard Cromwell's to his brother: "Your owne affaires in the entring into them," he wrote, "gave you some sight of persons, whose designe hath been for a long time layd to take roote, for the hindring Nationall advantages, in settlement, where it might occasion difficulty to there getting into the saddle, respecting there owne ambitious mindes, and advantages before Religion, peace or what else that may stand in there way. I dare not be plainer, as to particulerrize persons, or things, nor need I, you having knowledge of the ffoxes by his Smell." Without doubt Richard referred not only to Lambert, but also to Desborough, and to Fleetwood and his "mad party"; for Henry's entrance into the government of Ireland could have given him insight into the designs only of Fleetwood and those who supported or, rather, led him. In Richard's opinion the conflict of factions was so intense and so irreconcilable as to forebode ruin to the state. "I should relate how things are here," he continues, "and how the Publique Peace is tumbled and tossed, as if it were nothing to breath the veines of one another to a deadly gasping: . . . surely or sicknesses are very greate, and or disisease almost incurable, there is noe parte sounde."³

¹ For the attitude of the sectaries see an appeal to Fleetwood, unfortunately without date, in Thurloe, *State Papers*, VI. 244 ff.; also *A Second Narrative of the Late Parliament (so called)*, *Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 454.

² Some thought "that it would bee fitt my Lord Depyte should bee enabled to produce the same Congratulations for yor Highnes refusall from the Army in Ireland as had been made by some in Engld." H. Cromwell to O. Cromwell, June 5, 1657, B.M. Add. MS. 4157, folios 182, 183.

³ R. Cromwell to H. Cromwell, June 10, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 125.

Under these circumstances it was all-important that the new settlement should be as little defective and objectionable as possible. Otherwise no considerable party would rally to its support. Examination of the Humble Petition and Advice, however, shows that it was defective in several particulars, and contained clauses which were certain to provoke bitter opposition from the sectaries.

The most significant of these clauses were those concerning religion. The makers of the new constitution were evidently determined to erect a state church in England, and were indeed as much bent upon establishing a church as upon establishing a king. The whole instrument is redolent with this design.¹ The gist of the plan, however, is contained in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth articles. The tenth article voiced the desire of the House that the revilers of godly ministers or their assemblies, and the disturbers of public worship be punished according to law, and that where the laws were defective the Protector should assent to such laws "as shall be made in that behalf." Article 12 ratified all the acts passed by the Long Parliament abolishing the episcopal system, and so made impossible any return to that establishment. To these articles little objection could be made by any of the Puritan factions. The eleventh article, however, was of a far different character. It declared first that the Protestant religion alone should "be held forth and asserted for the public profession of these nations." Then followed what was the kernel of the whole religious plan of the Petition, that a "Confession of Faith" should be agreed upon by Cromwell and the Parliament. This confession was to "be asserted, held forth, and recommended to the people of these nations," and no one was to be suffered in speech or writing "maliciously or contemptuously" to assail it. The article then made a general provision for religious toleration, excluding from this "liberty," however, all Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, and Unitarians, all who denied the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and all such as "publish horrible blasphemies, or practice or hold forth licentiousness or profaneness under the profession of Christ." Provided a minister did not fall in any of these categories, he might differ "in matters of worship and discipline," but he must assent to the Confession of Faith if he was to "be capable of receiving the public maintenance appointed for the ministry." This article, therefore, not only denied toleration to a considerable number of persons who had hitherto possessed it, such as Quakers, Ranters, and Fifth Monarchists,

¹ See for instance Article 4 with its qualifications for members of Parliament, and its revival of the act of August 9, 1650, "against several atheistical, blasphemous, and execrable opinions derogatory to the honour of God, and destructive to human society."

but it pronounced those who did not assent to the public confession incapable of receiving public maintenance. The tithes and the ecclesiastical property of the state were to be devoted to a body of men holding a certain set of religious tenets. It is impossible to state definitely what these tenets were to be, but there can be little doubt that if Parliament had had its way, the new establishment would have been a modified form of Presbyterianism. Oliver would presumably oppose a Presbyterian system, yet it is conceivable that in time he would have consented to this; and certainly to accept Presbyterianism could not have been more difficult than to accept kingship. Indeed it is plain that now the two stood together, for the intense opposition of the sectaries in itself made any other combination impossible. Cromwell warmly approved of the Petition's provisions regarding religion,¹ and could not have been blind to their drift. Even supposing that a Presbyterian system could not be established while Oliver lived, this would certainly have come after his death, for his sons had little sympathy with the sectaries. Henry Cromwell, in outlining to Thurloe those provisions in the Humble Petition and Advice that seemed to him most important, laid stress upon the religious plan, approving warmly the "holdeing forth a publike confession of faith (the expectation of these nations) injoyning the acknowledgment of the sacraments, prayer, magistracy, and ministry, to be ordinances of God, and all this with due respect to tender consciences." ²

Parliament's purposes in regard to religion are clearly evidenced by several other events. Speaker Widdrington, in presenting the Humble Petition and Advice to the Protector, expressed clearly and frankly the object in view :

There are two extremities in state, concerning the causes of faith and religion, (that is to say) the permission of the exercise of more religions than one, which is a dangerous indulgence and toleration, and is not introduced by this government. . . . The other is the entering and sifting into men's consciences, when no overt scandal is given, . . . and which is desired to be provided against in this Frame.³

This view must have been sufficiently alarming to the extreme sectaries, yet that it correctly defined the position of Parliament is plain from the subsequent action of the House. Thus an act "for the better observation of the Lord's Day" compelled attendance at church under penalty of the forfeiture of two shillings six pence for non-attendance.⁴ This act was precisely similar to the acts under

¹ April 21, 1657, Stainer, *Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*, 331.

² H. Cromwell to Thurloe, April 8, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 183.

³ Burton, *Diary*, I. 408, 409.

⁴ June 26, 1657, *Calendar of State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 11.

Elizabeth and the Stuarts which had been objected to so bitterly by the Puritans. More significant still was the passage of a bill for catechizing.¹ It is impossible to say what this bill contained, but it was opposed by the more liberal and tolerant members of Parliament.² That it was an essentially anti-Independent bill can be inferred with certainty not only from this opposition, but also from Cromwell's position towards it and from the feeling his course aroused. It was the only bill that he vetoed, and this act bitterly incensed its supporters.³

The feeling of the sectaries in regard to the new religious settlement was clearly expressed in the *Narrative of the Late Parliament*, wherein the author caustically criticizes the settlement, and as a proof of the designs of the Parliament points to the bill for catechizing.⁴ It is not surprising that these various alarming events convinced the sectaries that a movement was being made to suppress them, and that Oliver was party to it. Many of them had been convinced of this as early as August, 1655, a conviction expressed in a well-known pamphlet directed against the Protector.⁵ Libelous as this pamphlet was, in so far as Cromwell's intentions were concerned, it was nevertheless a truthful statement of the direction that events were bound to take. The realization of their fears by the passage of the Humble Petition and Advice—this attempt to establish a national church and to shut out from the benefits of public maintenance all ministers who did not conform to its Confession of Faith—explains and justifies the opposition of the sectaries not only to the project of kingship but to the whole constitution.⁶

That the Humble Petition and Advice was left imperfect in many particulars might be inferred from the speed with which it was made and from the necessity of compromising the differences be-

¹ *Commons' Journals*, VII. 537, 551.

² Burton, II. 202, 203.

³ *Ibid.*, 205, 206; *Commons' Journals*, III. 551-553.

⁴ *Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 445.

⁵ *A Short Discovery of his Highness the Lord Protector's Intentions Touching the Anabaptists in the Army, and all such as are against his reforming things in the Church*, August 20, 1655, Thomason Tracts, E. 852. The writer charges Cromwell with the intention of setting up a state church and overthrowing the Anabaptists.

⁶ The attempt to establish a national church did not cease with the overthrow of the monarchists in 1657. In the second session of the Parliament, on January 21, 1657/8, Mr. Gewen moved for "a convocation or assembly of divines." The motion was discussed but came to nothing. Burton, II. 333-336. In Cromwell's speech of January 25 he speaks against the sects. Stainer, 377-379. See also *ibid.*, 387. On January 27, preaching before Parliament, the Reverend Mr. Griffith in his sermon spoke "for church government, but against imposing spirits; and it tasted a little of Court holy water." Burton, II. 373.

tween parties with regard to it.¹ The imperfection of the constitution was made irretrievable by the alteration of the title from king to protector. Incomplete and imperfect as the Petition might be, the acceptance of the office and title of king would have carried with it so many consequences, would have reestablished so many old legal institutions, that all defects would probably have been surmounted. But the lawyers were certainly correct in arguing that the laws could not be administered without the kingly office. They were correct because the mere conviction on their part was sufficient to make it impossible to administer the laws without the office. Furthermore, the protectoral office, since it had been conferred without a specific definition of its powers, left matters still unsettled. Moreover, since the proposal to grant to the protector precisely the same prerogatives as those inhering in the royal title had been rejected, only one conclusion could be drawn, namely, that the powers of the protector were not those of the king. What they were no man could tell. The consequences would be confusion in the interpretation of the law, contradictory decisions by the courts, and endless and hopeless endeavors to fit the new executive to the old institutions.

The failure to establish the kingship was of vast consequence in respect to the succession. The Petition permitted Cromwell to nominate his own successor, but made no provision for his successor's successor. Had he been king, the law would have determined all doubts. As things actually stood, the succession was left in almost as indefinite a condition as before the adoption of the new constitution.

More important still was the position assigned to the "other house" in the new scheme.² The judicial functions of the new house were defined in precise general terms, but its legislative functions were not. As matters stood, this was a prime defect. When Parliament framed the Petition, it had expected to have a king, in which case the legislative status of the new house would have been *ipso facto* determined. As a House of Lords its legislative functions would have been precisely those of the old House of Peers. Under

¹ For the speed with which the Humble Petition and Advice was made see Packer, February 9, 1658/9, Burton, III. 161; Baynes, February 11, 1658/9, *ibid.*, 216. Article 15, with the title of king in it, was omitted from the printed text, no effort being made to supply the omission, so that in all printed copies the bewildered reader passes directly from the fourteenth to the sixteenth article. Lenthall on June 23, 1657, asserted that the Petition and Advice was "very imperfect yet" and that he regarded it as being merely an "embryo." *Ibid.*, II. 280.

² In the original Humble Petition and Advice the nominations of members of the "other house" were to be approved by the House of Commons. The Humble Additional Explanatory Petition and Advice, however, left the nominations wholly in the hands of the protector.

a protectorate this was certainly not self-evident. That the "other house" was in fact "inconsistent with this title" of protector was so clear that during the debates after Cromwell's refusal of kingship it was taken for granted, the proposal being made to give up the house as a matter of course if the title protector was adopted.¹ That this motion was not carried shows pretty clearly that kingship was not abandoned. That the advocates of monarchical government insisted on retaining the "other house" without further definition of its status, its authority, and its powers is equally good evidence of the purpose to hold to their course. If they had been willing permanently to surrender their wishes, the position of the new house could have been settled in the sense agreeable to the opposing party without much difficulty. Unless, however, the project for kingship was completely surrendered, it was impossible to define further the functions and powers of the "other house"; for if this had been attempted, the partizans of a commonwealth would have "ravelled into" the entire frame of government to some purpose, in all probability with consequences disastrous to the plan.² The "other house," just as it existed, was an inevitable result of Cromwell's declining the kingship; and in forcing this upon him the army leaders won a great victory. "How have they," wrote an angry Oliverian, "forced him (as *Aaron*) to make a Calfe like the Ægyptian Ox, an other House instead of a House of Peers?"³ The victory consisted in erecting an institution which was not viable as it existed, which must be altered, which must lead either to a kingly settlement or to the undoing of what had already been accomplished towards such a settlement. It was not by chance, therefore, that the attack of the opposition in the second session was directed against the "other house." The vulnerable part of the new settlement lay there, and there also lay the most serious menace to the advocates of military rule, of sectarianism, of the Commonwealth.

How differently the various parties regarded the status of the new house is shown by all the available evidence. From the first the monarchists hesitated to admit that they were attempting to create a House of Lords. On the contrary they assured opponents

¹ Whether "such things" in the Petition, "as may be therein conceived inconsistent with this title, may not be expunged, as House of Lords and such like." News letter, May 15, 1657, *Clarke Papers*, III. 108.

² See on this difficulty Goodwin's motion, June 24, 1657, Burton, II. 300; Shapcott, *ibid.*, 298; Sydenham, *ibid.*, 299; Desborough, *ibid.*

³ *A Petitionary Epistle directed to the Lord Protector and People of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to continue in Unity*. March 19, 1657/8, Thomson Tracts, E. 743. 7, p. 4.

of the measure that all they wished was a balance or check upon the House of Commons in order to preserve liberty of conscience. There was to be no restoration of the old Lords.¹ It was even argued that the new house would be a bar to the restoration of the old one.² The supporters of another house asserted too that it was necessary to have a second house with "judicial power," since it was doubtful if the House of Commons possessed such power, and since, even if it did, too much time would be consumed in considering "complaints from Courts of Justice and Equity."³ The "great reason" alleged, however, was "that Bills passed too hastily" in a single house, and without sufficient discussion.⁴

It is evident that the royalists did not dare openly to champion a House of Lords. Even as it was, they found much difficulty in securing the assent of their opponents to the establishment of a new house.⁵ At last, however, the latter yielded to the arguments adduced, coupled with the assurance that there was no intention of restoring the old peers. They were willing to have a second house, provided only it was not a House of Lords. Neville, one of the Commonwealth leaders, argued indeed in favor of a second house with this limitation;⁶ and the army, after the dissolution of the Rump, while declaring against a restoration of the peers, favored the erection of a senate to keep the Commons within bounds.⁷

The argument against a House of Lords was perfectly intelligible and extremely simple: if a House of Lords was established, the old nobility would inevitably be admitted; and if the old nobility were admitted, the restoration of the Stuarts was certain.⁸

The Petition failed also to define the manner in which nominations were to be made to the new house after Oliver's death. The grant of power to nominate members was to Oliver alone, without mention of his heirs and successors. It could be argued therefore that future protectors had no authority to nominate members. Had

¹ "Never was any thing brought in with more sugar-sweet and plausible words. It shall be a check upon restraint of liberty of conscience. There shall be no bringing in of the old nobility." Packer, Burton, III. 165. See also Sydenham, *ibid.*, II. 299; Cromwell's speech to the officers, February 28, 1656/7, Stainer, 263, 264.

² Burton, II. 413.

³ Colonel Matthews, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 451.

⁴ *Idem.*, *ibid.*

⁵ "The other house, or ballance goes heavily on." Sir John Reynolds to H. Cromwell, February 24, 1656/7, Lansdowne MS. 823, folio 90. "That, we feare, will most stick with us, is the ballance, or house of Lords as some call it; of wch we hope to see an yssue within 4 dayes." J. Bridges to H. Cromwell, March 3, 1656/7, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 93. The "other house," Thurloe feared, would "prove a very hard and doubtfull question." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 8, 1656/7, Thurloe, VI. 93.

⁶ February 8, 1658/9, Burton, III. 134.

⁷ Firth, *Cromwell's Army*, 382.

⁸ Sydenham, June 24, 1657, Burton, II. 298.

the monarchy been reëstablished, this grant to Oliver alone could have created no legal difficulty, for a king is a corporation sole, and therefore his powers and prerogatives vest without interruption in his successor. In other words, the king never dies.

Another shortcoming of the Humble Petition and Advice was the failure to provide for the distribution of members of the lower house. The plan of reformed constituencies embodied in the Instrument of Government perished with the Instrument. It was probably unsatisfactory to the members, or they would have adopted it in the new constitution as it stood. The question of a new reformed distribution was discussed on May 27, 1657, but the House got no further than to pass a resolution that the subject should be finally debated in one week from that date.¹ But the predetermined day was later set apart as a day of thanksgiving for Blake's victory at Vera Cruz, and the discussion concerning distribution was never resumed. As a consequence the old unreformed constituencies revived.² Not only so, but the failure to determine the distribution of seats left the new constitution without a specific provision for electing members to Parliament from Scotland and Ireland.³

The question arises too whether Cromwell was really possessed of a veto under the new protectorate. He certainly believed that he was, for on one occasion he exercised a veto. Yet one may well doubt that the Petition and Advice granted this prerogative; and in Richard's Parliament the privilege was hotly questioned. If Cromwell had become king, the veto would have been his as part of the royal prerogative, but a protector as protector had no such prerogative, and the Humble Petition and Advice did not specifically confer it upon him.

In short, although the new constitution was an advance along the line which government in England was bound to take, though it restored the rights of the people and the privileges of Parliament, though it increased the powers of the houses and diminished those of the executive, it was astonishingly imperfect and could not possibly be a final settlement.

Under the circumstances it was of the utmost importance that the new government should be intrusted to those who desired its success. The principal opponents of kingship, with the exception

¹ *Ibid.*, 138, 139.

² That Cromwell believed the old system to be reëstablished may be inferred from the fact that in granting a charter to Swansea, May 3, 1658, he constituted it a parliamentary borough. *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXX. 152, article "Philip Jones."

³ Clarges to H. Cromwell, June 22, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 193. See also in Burton the discussion over this point in Richard Cromwell's Parliament.

of Fleetwood, Desborough, and a few others, could certainly not be counted among this number. Changes in the form of government, as Henry Cromwell sagaciously pointed out, were of no avail so long as the same men remained in power. He therefore strongly advocated the purging of the council and the army. In other words, he wished the government to be intrusted to those whom he called "the honest party."¹

The Protector, however, had evidently resolved upon a compromise government, and was not inclined to purge either council or army. The only new councilors created were Thurloe, who received the dignity on July 13, 1657,² and the Protector's eldest son, Richard, who was made councilor at the request of the council in December of the same year.³ But the opposition of one man had been so venomous, and in the opinion of all so clearly factious and self-seeking, that he could not overlook it. The offender was John Lambert, and over him came the first struggle of parties in the new government. Lambert was throughout supported by Sydenham, another influential member of the council; and neither of the malcontents came near Whitehall for weeks after the final decision.⁴ Some believed that Lambert would either surrender his commission or have it taken from him. Thurloe was confident that he would not surrender it, and believed there would be serious danger in permitting him to retain his power. Others, however, presumably Fleetwood and Desborough, were of a different opinion.⁵ Henry Cromwell agreed with Thurloe. "I take notice of your opinion concerning [Lambert]," he wrote. "I hope H. H. is sufficiently cautioned concerning him, and I wish those, who think his continuance in power safe, doe not first feele the smarte of it."⁶ Lambert himself apparently began to suspect that he had overstepped the limits of his power. "My Lord Lambert lookes but sadly," wrote Russell. "He puts me in mind of a saying of old Solomons, that there is an appointed time for all things under the sun, to hate as well as to love, to be sad as well as merry."⁷ On July 13 the council was to be sworn, and Cromwell had already laid commands upon Lambert, probably to absent himself. "I doubt not," wrote Fleetwood on the fourteenth, "yu will heare his

¹ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 17, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 811. See also H. Cromwell to Thurloe, and to Fauconberg, same date, *ibid.*, 810. He wished to see St. John and Pierrepont admitted to the council. Same to Thurloe, July 15, 1657, *ibid.*, 404.

² *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, 206, 208, 239.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 17, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 411, 412.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ H. Cromwell to Thurloe, July 15, 1657, *ibid.*, VI. 404.

⁷ Sir F. Russell to H. Cromwell, July 4, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 823, folio 145.

Highnes commands to my Lord Lambert. Such passages of providence are to be teachings to us.”¹ Lambert, it was said, refused to take the oath imposed upon members of the council, and was removed as a consequence.² His commission was surrendered on July 23. Whether he refused to take the oath or not is uncertain; but if he did, he appears later to have expressed a willingness to comply. “I suppose,” wrote Thurloe, “I writ your lordship, that . . . [Lambert] desired to serve in the councelle, and offered to take his oath; that is paused upon. He is now retired in appearance. Most of the officers of the army, and those most suspected, shew rather satisfaction then otherwise.”³ Lambert’s offer was not accepted.

The dismissal caused an immense sensation and convinced men that Oliver meant to be master and probably monarch. “All men expected,” wrote Baillie, “that when so easily Lambert was quashed, the next session of Parliament would have quickly made Cromwell king.”⁴ The act, however, remained an isolated one, Cromwell making no attempt to root out Lambert’s adherents.

His monarchist followers, however, could not adopt a similar philosophical attitude, and it cannot be doubted that they still worked silently towards the wished-for goal. “The little secretary” might in the bitter moment of defeat avow his enduring faith in the considerableness of “simplicity,” but he could not help pursuing the game; and he urged members to come up to the next session and complete the work. John Ashe wrote that he would strive to be present at the opening of the session, “that I may give my best assistance for the perfecting the happy settlement wch is soe much expected and desired by all those that love his Highnesse and the peace and safety of these nations.”⁵ Lord Broghill, most pertinacious of kingmakers, saw no reason to despair. He remonstrated earnestly with Montague, who had announced an intention of retir-

¹ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, July 14, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 821, folio 323.

² Stoope to Marigny, August 10, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 427; J. R. to Colonel Whitley, ^{July 24} August 3, 1657, *Cal. St. Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 41; — to John Franklin, ^{July 23} August 2, 1657, *ibid.*, 40; *Third Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 247. See an interesting account by Bernardi of Lambert’s dismissal, ^{July 30} August 9, 1657, in Prayer, “Oliviero Cromwell dalla Battaglia di Worcester alla sua Morte,” in *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria*, XVI. (Genoa, 1882) 438.

³ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 28, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 425. Lambert’s name is not mentioned by Thurloe, but there can be no doubt that it is he to whom reference is made. The only other who could by any possibility be intended was Sydenham. Sydenham, however, took the councilor’s oath on July 21. *Cal. St. Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 32.

⁴ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Robert Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III. 359.

⁵ John Ashe to Thurloe, December 28, 1657, Rawlinson MS. A. 56, folio 337.

ing. From this intention "I conclude," he wrote, "the game our mastere is to manage is either very desperate, that you give it over, or very certain, since you think it needs not your help." He ended by urging Montague to continue in public life for the good of the cause.¹ That he was intent upon attempting once more to make Oliver king may be inferred with certainty from a letter of Henry Cromwell's to him, written in February, 1658.²

The success or failure of such plans to establish monarchy would depend very largely upon the composition of the new house. If its members were monarchists, if they were men having the confidence of the nation, if they were to a considerable extent members of the old peerage, then the object aimed at by Broghill and his adherents might be attained. If, on the contrary, the new house was constituted for the most part of army men and antimonarchists, then the difficulty of creating a king would be immensely enhanced. But the importance of the new house did not cease here. Upon its success, one may confidently assert, depended the success or failure of the new government.

The vital importance of this question escaped no one, and the subject was discussed in all its phases. Despite the fact that the Humble Petition and Advice created the new dignities only for life, there were not wanting those who held that the new lordships would be hereditary. The writs to be issued would certainly create the recipients lords, asserted the supporters of monarchy. Philip Jones, writing to Montague, informed him that his "writt of the 20th of January" made him "a Baron as the learned lawyers say, . . . but sure our Petetion and Advice makes it but for life."³ On the other side, it was said by those not so near to the springs of information that the judges had declared that no legal writ creating barons could be issued until Cromwell became king.⁴ This was probably the opinion of the majority of the lawyers. Prynne, who

¹ Broghill to Montague, November 20, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 622.

² "As for the reviving, etc., I am really at my wit's ends. You cannot but imagine, that too near concernment, and my imperfect knowledge of affairs, make me incapable of advising any thing hereupon. But I rely upon your lordship's wisdom and integrity herein, and shall earnestly beseech the Lord to encrease it upon this most difficult attempt of your lordship." H. Cromwell to Broghill, [February, 1657/8], *ibid.*, 790.

³ Philip Jones to Montague, December 22, 1657, Carte MS. 73, folio 125.

⁴ "The Judges being lately required by his Highnesse to make the forme of writt whereby the intended members of the other House might be called to sit in parliament, their answer was that until his Highness did accept of the title of King noe legall writs could be made, nor house of Peeres constituted." News-letter, November 17, 1657, *Clarke Papers*, III. 127.

"They may not take their new honors till Cromwell has assumed the title of King, . . ." T. Mompasson to [Secretary Nicholas], January 4, 1657/8, *Cal. State Papers, Dom.*, 1657-1658, p. 255.

could not long remain silent, busied himself with a new edition of his treatise *A Plea for the Lords and House of Peers*, wherein he argued that all the old nobility had an undoubted right to sit in Parliament, and that all the judicial powers of Parliament were vested in the king and the House of Lords.¹

In this state of affairs it was of prime importance that the men who were to compose the new house should be selected with the utmost skill and wisdom. The task of selection, however, was no small one, the difficulty proving "great between those, who are fitt and not willinge to serve, and those who are willinge, and expect it, and are not fitt."² "I doubt," wrote Montague with gloomy forebodings, "divers whom I could (and I beleeeve yr Lo^{pp} also) wish were of it will not middle, and noe doubt divers others will readily supply theire places. I heartily wish it otherwise."³ Undoubtedly Montague's chief doubts were in relation to the old nobility, and here he was justified. It is conceivable that the peers summoned would have been willing to sit had the summons come from a king. It can hardly be doubted, too, that many more of them would have been summoned if Oliver had been king instead of protector. As it was, the old peers, even those friendly to Cromwell, would not answer his summons.⁴ Even the Scotch lords would not sit. Only Warriston and Lockhart represented Scotland; "Cassilis disdained it."⁵ As might be expected, those men who had most strongly supported the new kingship were also unwilling to take part. For instance, Pierrepont and St. John were nominated, but did not sit.

Under these circumstances Oliver did the best he could. He was of course bound to compromise, and consequently selected men of all parties. Had he been bent upon becoming king, this would hardly have happened. The choice of Hazelrigg seems almost ludicrous; the selection of Pride and a score of the keenest opponents of the kingship must have seemed folly to men like Thurloe. Oliver, it is true, consulted representatives of all parties:

¹ Prynne's treatise, *A Plea for the Lords and House of Peers* (London, May, 1658), first published in 1647, now in a "much augmented" form (518 pages) on account of the "late loud unexpected Votes at Westminster of, a New King and House of Lords, under the Name, Notion of Another House." Thomason Tracts, E. 751.

² Thurloe to H. Cromwell, December 1, 1657, Thurloe, VI. 648.

³ Montague to H. Cromwell, December 5, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 822, folio 295.

⁴ Not even the Earl of Warwick, with whom he was connected by marriage. For this attitude of the old peers see the letter of Lord Say and Sele to Lord Wharton, December 29, 1657, *English Historical Review*, X. 106, 107. Only one member of the old peerage sat.

⁵ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 359.

Montague,¹ his council,² Pierrepont,³ and probably all of his close friends of both factions. Naturally, after puzzling over the matter for weeks he ended by dissatisfying everybody. On December 8 Thurloe wrote in evident disgust, "I begin to guesse who they are like to be ; and I am content your excellencye should receive them by any other hand."⁴ In January Henry Cromwell wrote sadly to Broghill, "If you had been there time enough, your lordship might have been carpenter of a better house."⁵ When finally the selection was made, Thurloe was so exasperated that he apparently neglected of set purpose to send the list to Henry Cromwell.⁶ His indignation was undoubtedly occasioned by the conviction that the new house would prove itself an insurmountable obstacle to the erection of a monarchy.

Most people felt that if the old lords honored the new house by their presence, it would be enormously strengthened and might succeed. Their attitude, therefore, was scrutinized closely by all parties. "Some say the lords Warwick, Manchester, Wharton and others are not inclined to sitt," wrote Needham on January 7.⁷ "Some of our other howse, it seemes," wrote Fleetwood, "have not a minde to sitt with us, upon the account of the hereditary peerage";⁸ and Thomas Fox on January 23 notes that "Not any of the old Lords come in yet."⁹ The lords did not come, and the failure gave a weapon to the opposition of which they availed themselves. They would not recognize the new house as a House of Peers, and laid particular emphasis upon the fact that the old nobility did not appear there.¹⁰

The new government was therefore foredoomed to failure, and this failure was made absolutely certain and irretrievable by the composition of the House of Commons. The Cromwellians there, weakened by the transfer of many of their ablest men to the other house, and still further by the admission of the formerly

¹ "My oportunityes wth his Highnesse are not manye nor is my judgement fitt to advise him but I have not spared to speake as occation hath beene offered unto mee." Montague to H. Cromwell, December 5, 1657, Lansdowne MS. 822, folio 295.

² *Clarke Papers*, III. 127; Thurloe, VI. 630; Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, November 24, [1657], *ibid.*, 631.

³ H. Cromwell to Thurloe, November 25, 1657, *ibid.*, 633.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, December 8, 1657, *ibid.*, 665.

⁵ H. Cromwell to Broghill, January 13, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 745.

⁶ H. Cromwell to Broghill, *ibid.*

⁷ Needham to Swift, January 7, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 734.

⁸ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, January 16, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 752.

⁹ Thomas Fox, January 23, 1657/8, Stowe MS. 185, folio 123.

¹⁰ "Scrupling to owne all of them as Lords, especially seing the Earles of Warwick, Mulgrave and Manchester the Lo: Wharton and Lo: Say did not appeare there." Letter to Lord Wharton, January 27, 1657/8, Carte MS. 103, folio 86.

excluded members, had no strength to resist the attacks of their opponents.

Cromwell foresaw none of the difficulties, and opened the second session of his Parliament in good spirits, being perhaps the one man who had complete confidence in the new frame of government. "We hope we may say," he exclaimed, "we have arrived at what is much beyond our expectations." The Petition and Advice had restored to the nation both its civil and its religious liberties, and for that he was sure they had "all cause to bless God."¹ By implication he avowed the new house to be a house of peers, addressing the assembled houses as "my Lords, and Gentlemen of the House of Commons," and speaking of the protest of the bishops against laws "made by this House and the House of Commons."² He urged them in conclusion to be "the repairers of breaches, and the restorers of paths to dwell in."³

The opposition in the House of Commons, however, was not anxious to repair breaches. On the contrary, it assaulted the Humble Petition and Advice by refusing to acknowledge the other house as a House of Lords. Day after day the question of the powers of the "other house" was debated, and "confusion worse confounded" held sway. On January 25 Cromwell appealed to the houses to go forward in the important work which lay before them, solemnly asserting, "I conceive the well-being, yea the being of these nations is now at stake." He then pointed out the political situation and its dangers at home and abroad, attempting especially to arouse feeling for the condition of Protestants on the continent. Concluding this head, he spoke strongly and with a direct appeal concerning the religious and political divisions at home, urging the houses "to uphold this settlement, which I have no cause to think but you are agreed to and that you like it." Over and over again in the most solemn language he adjured them to preserve peace and amity.

We have peace and the Gospel. Let us have one heart and soul, one mind to maintain the honest and just rights of this nation, . . . I beseech you and charge you in the name and presence of God, and as before him, be sensible of these things and lay them to heart. . . . If God shall [not] unite your hearts and bless you, and give you the blessing of union and love one to another, and tread down everything that riseth up in your hearts or tendeth to deceive your own souls with pretences of this and that thing that we speak of, and [if you do] not prefer the keeping of peace, that we may see the fruits of righteousness in them that love peace and embrace peace, it will be said of this poor nation, *Actum est de Anglia*.⁴

¹ Speech of January 20, 1657/8, Stainer, 357-359.

² *Ibid.*, 362.

³ *Ibid.*, 365.

⁴ Speech of January 25, 1657/8, Stainer, 365-387.

It was in vain, however. The republicans were resolved to set all in confusion, and they were at this very moment immensely strengthened by the accession of Lambert and Hazelrigg. These two appeared in the House for the first time on January 25,¹ and Hazelrigg immediately took the leadership of the republican party. On the other hand, Oliver seemed determined to have the "other house" recognized as a House of Lords. Neither side would yield in the slightest degree. Oliver's insistence apparently precipitated the crisis. On January 28, in answer to a committee of the House of Commons, which requested directions concerning the printing of his speech of the twenty-fifth, he refused bluntly to give such directions, on the ground that such action might be a breach of the privileges of the other house. He gave the committee distinctly to understand that the other house must be recognized as a House of Lords if he and Parliament were to agree.² After this, compromise was impossible.

Despite the hopelessness of the situation, the effort to make Cromwell king was resumed. On January 28 Major Beake and Colonel Shapcott moved to debate the title of Protector, and the status of the "other house."³ On February 2 Sir John Trevor moved a return to the old constitution with kings, lords,⁴ and commons. On the following day Mr. Gewen moved that kingship should be reëstablished,⁵ and was supported by Colonel Cox.⁶ There was no heart, however, in this renewal of the old attempt. The leaders of the monarchists remained silent, and indeed it was perfectly plain that for the present nothing of the sort could succeed.

In short, the situation was absolutely desperate. "I am amazed at proceedings," wrote Henry Cromwell, "and have a kind of dread in considering them."⁷ On the same day he appealed to Fleetwood "to incline to what is rational and consistent . . . to seek the peace of these distressed and distempered nations."⁸ There was certainly cause for amazement and dread, for the antimonarchists had struck upon a bold — one may say a seditious — plan to

¹ Fauconberg to Lockhart, ^{January 25} ^{February 4}, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 757. Hazelrigg's action was all the more significant because he had been nominated to the upper house.

² Speech of January 28, 1657/8, Stainer, 387, 388. "I say the House of Lords," Burton, II. 380. "His Highness has resolved to have it by that title." Bodurda, February 4, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 442.

³ *Ibid.*, 377 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 412.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 424.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 437.

⁷ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 3, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 775.

⁸ He adds, "I need not tell you the effects of a breach, of a new unsettlement at this time, when our wants are so very great." H. Cromwell to Fleetwood, February 3, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 774.

restore the Commonwealth by a union between the disaffected part of the army, the sectaries, and the opposition in Parliament.¹ The movement culminated in the drawing of a petition to Parliament, praying for the restoration of the Commonwealth. The principal points aimed at were (1) to secure to the people "the constant succession of Free Parliaments duely chosen," and (2) to secure the "unquestioned Supreme Power to the said Parliaments."² This petition was openly circulated, some fifty copies being printed for the purpose, and it was signed by many thousands of people in and about London.³ The leading actor in its promulgation was apparently John Weaver, a noted Commonwealth's-man, who with several of his party "made it their buissnesse to perswade to a commonwealth, and were confident, that they should carry it; and the petition . . . was to be the first occasion for the debate of it in the house; and a cheife man of them useinge arguments to another very considerable person to engage with them for the old parlament, and beinge answered, that it was impossible, because the army was against it, he replied, that he would take it upon him, that the army would declare for it, and that he knew they had beene tryed in

¹ "About which time also, a Petition was preparing, by some faithfull Friends to the good old Cause, in, and about the City of London, which was afterward printed, and signed with many thousand Hands; which Petition makes Mention of the severall Particulars that were the Grounds of Contest between the late King, and Parliament, and the good people of the Nation. And prayeth, 'The Settling those good Things fought for, as the Reward and Fruit of the Blood and Treasure so greatly expended in the late Wars, etc.' This Petition was ready to be presented to the Parliament, in a peaceable Way, by the Hands of about Twenty in the name of the rest, desiring to submit the Issue thereof to God, and the Wisdom of that Assembly." *A Second Narrative of the late Parliament (so called) in Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 450.

² The following is an abstract of the petition: Objects. (1) to secure to the people (a) "the constant succession of Free Parliaments duely chosen," and (b) "unquestioned supreme power to the said Parliaments"; (2) the militia to be settled, and people and Parliaments protected against improper use of said militia; (3) no money to be levied without consent of Parliament"; (4) (a) that "the peoples persons and Estates may be onely subject to be disposed of according to the Laws of the Land," and (b) "speedy consideration had of the long Imprisonment of many persons well-affected . . . without any due prosecution"; (5) officers and soldiers not to "be turned out of their respective imployments without a legall Triall at a Court-Martial." *A True Copy of a Petition Signed by very many Peaceable and Well-affected People, Inhabiting in and about the City of London, and intended to have been delivered to the late Parliament*, Thomason Tracts, E, 743:5, March 11, 1657/8.

³ "The Petitioners did not carry on their businesse in a secret underhand way, but openly; . . . and the Petition being framed and agreed unto, . . . about 50 copies were printed and dispersed in order to Subscription, and in a few dayes (notwithstanding many frowns from Grandees, and a numerous Army then quartered in and about the City to the terrour of very many) it was signed by many thousands, and ready to have been presented by a few (under a score) in the name of the rest." *Ibid.* The similarity of the language here and in the *Second Narrative*, where this matter is treated, would lead to the supposition that either the writers were the same, or the author of the *Narrative* had this pamphlet before him when he wrote.

it.”¹ According to Bordeaux the petition was largely the result of the bitter opposition of the sectarian clergymen, who “excited” the Commonwealth’s-men to present the petition, and “spake high and openly against the government of his highness.”² That the movement was wide-spread may be safely asserted. The commander of the garrison at Hull wrote Cromwell that his opponents there “were very high before the desolution of Parliament, haveing undoubtedly a dangerous designe in agitation.”³

No movement so serious for Cromwell’s régime had hitherto been started. The Cavaliers, Fifth Monarchy Men, and the Commonwealth’s-men had opposed him persistently and bitterly, but without securing much support. The attempt to erect a kingship, however, had consolidated the Commonwealth party, had driven many men hitherto friendly to Oliver into its ranks, and for a moment had united all opponents excepting only the Cavaliers. The boldness of the petition for the overthrow of the government went far beyond anything hitherto conceived, yet undoubtedly the petition itself was the direct result of the officers’ petition of May, 1657. If the army could petition unrebuked for a certain form of government, why might not the supporters of a commonwealth do likewise?

The immediate result was the dissolution of Parliament.⁴ Cromwell, to the surprise of everyone, in a rage summoned the two houses, and arraigned the Commons in a speech which revealed the bitterness of his soul, and his conviction that the new settlement had fallen in ruins. “I looked,” he said, “that the same men that had made that frame would have made it good to me when I came to act your Petition and Advice.” Otherwise he would have preferred to live “under a woodside to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than to have undertaken such a place as this was.” But he had taken it only because he had expected settlement, and “the safety of the nations,” as was well known to “all that did advise and petition . . . and I am failed in these terms.” They had refused to

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 269; Bordeaux to Mazarin, February $\frac{4}{14}$, 1657/8, *ibid.*, VI. 778; Bordeaux to Brienne, February $\frac{4}{14}$, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 779. Bordeaux here agrees with Thurloe in the general facts.

² Bordeaux to Mazarin, February $\frac{4}{14}$, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778.

³ C. H. Smith to Oliver Cromwell, February 11, 1657/8, Rawl. MS. A. 57, folio 312.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 269; *Second Narrative, Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 450; J. Berners to E. H., *Eng. Hist. Review*, VII. 106, 107; Bordeaux to Mazarin, February $\frac{4}{14}$, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778; Ludlow (Firth’s edition), II. 33; Bernardi, $\frac{\text{February } 22}{\text{March } 4}$, 1657/8, Prayer, 469; Payne to Nieuport, February $\frac{5}{15}$, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 781. For the surprise which Cromwell’s act gave, even to his council, see Fauconberg to H. Cromwell, February 9, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 788; H. Cromwell to Lord Broghill, February 17, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 811.

recognize the "other house"; they had refused to carry out the new government in accordance with their oaths. Had they settled that government, "not to make hereditary Lords nor to make hereditary King or Kings — ye had had a basis to stand upon," and "if there was an intention of settlement you would have settled upon this [basis] to have altered or allayed. . . . But this hath not ben done, it hath not. . . . Instead a new business hath been seeking in the room of this, this actual settlement, settlement by your consent . . . really, designing a Commonwealth, that some tribune of the people might be the man that might rule all. This hath been the business really. I am sorry to say it, but I think the meanest people that go about the streets take notice of it. This is the business; but is this all? They have engaged, or persuaded others to engage to carry that thing on; . . . We have known these things have been designed, we have known attempts have been made in the Army to seduce them, and almost the greatest confidence hath been in the Army to break us and divide us. . . ." There were endeavors, too, "from some not far from this place to stir up the people of this town into tumultings, what if I said rebellion. . . . Yea, and to draw the Army to the state of a question, a Commonwealth, a Commonwealth." These things being so, "I do declare to you here, that I do dissolve this Parliament. Let God judge between you and me."¹

So ended in complete failure the attempt to settle the government under the Humble Petition and Advice. That it was failure was everywhere recognized. The writer of the *Second Narrative* jubilantly asserted that had Parliament continued to sit, it might have "overvoted the Lovers of Freedom, and so have perfected their Instrument of Bondage, and rivetted it on the Necks of the good People for ever by a Law, and thereby made them Vassals and Slaves perpetually. But hitherto the Lord hath, in a great measure, frustrated their wicked Designs, blessed be his holy name."²

The part which the failure to define clearly the status and functions of the "other house" had played in this unexpected outcome was obvious to all. Josias Berners, writing to his cousin John Hobart, a steady and thorough supporter of the kingship, upbraided the monarchists for their neglect. It was a wonder, he asserted, that wise men should have spent so much time upon a title, a matter "merely extrinsicall," while neglecting to build the main structure, a house of lords, upon a sure foundation. "See," he ex-

¹ Stainer, 388–397. The "Amen episode," so well known, is vouched for in the Philips manuscript, printed in the *Old Parliamentary History*; in the Clarke manuscript, Stainer, 483; and by Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

² *A Second Narrative, Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 452.

claimed, "howe many badd consequences doe, and hereafter must follow."¹ Friends of the project for kingship and a restored House of Lords hoped that "the vanity of Messages and Messengers during the last fortnight's sitting" would free them forever from half-hearted expedients which could never provide settlement.² Undoubtedly the criticism was to the point, but nevertheless the monarchists were not to be upbraided with neglect, for, as has already been pointed out, they had done the best that they could. Their blamelessness, however, could not save the situation. The "other house" could hardly hope to recover from its colossal failure, totally disowned as it had been by almost everyone concerned.³

There were many conjectures as to what Oliver would do next, but the prevailing opinion seems to have been that he would call a "great council," which should "manage the affairs of the nation."⁴ It is quite possible that this expedient was suggested. Before anything final could be done, however, the government had to be certain that its existence was for the present assured. Oliver's first step, therefore, was to appeal to the army and to the city for support. On February 6 he addressed the officers at Whitehall, urging those who could not "in conscience conform to the now government" to speak out, and expressing the hope that they would still be able to go along together as in the past. The officers declared themselves satisfied and promised their support.⁵ So, too, the city officials, when appealed to, renewed their pledges of fidelity and

¹ Josias Berners (?) to John Hobart, no date, no signature, Tanner MS. 51, folio 3.

² *A Petitionary Epistle directed to the Lord Protector and People of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, to Continue in Unity*, March 19, 1657/8, Thomason Tracts, E. 743, 7, p. 4.

³ There was much pertinency in the description of the situation as sketched by an opponent of the "other house" in 1658:

"The *other House* constituted by it, when summoned, was totally disowned 1 — By the Commons themselves who created it by *this Petition and Advice*; yet would not acknowledge, but disclaimed it when erected; And if these *Creators* would not own this their *mungrell ill compacted new creature*, there is no probability, that any future Knights, Citizens, or Burgesses will approve or submit unto it: 2ly, By the *antient Peers*, and most *Gentlemen of Estate and Interest* summoned to this *other House*, who refused to sit, or own it at the first, upon such terms as will engage them to disown it for the future, and not to appear therein though summoned. 3ly, By the generality of the people, who disrelished, and made no addresses to it upon any occasion 4ly, This *House* and last Convention were thereupon suddenly dissolved by him that called and constituted them, as seeing no hopes nor possibilities of reconciling or uniting them; Therefore none else can possibly hope to peece or unite them in any New Convention summoned according to this *Petition and Advice*." *A Probable Expedient for present and future Publique Settlement*, November, 1658, Thomason Tracts, E. 766, 4, p. 2.

⁴ Bordeaux to Mazarin, February 1st, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 778. Hartlib wrote to Pell to the same effect.

⁵ Stainer, 398. See also his notes on this speech.

aid.¹ Late in March the assurances of the officers of the English army took form in an address signed by 224 of them.² In this they assured Cromwell that "notwithstanding the base Calumnies and Lies . . . dispersed throughout the whole Nation" to the effect that the army was divided, and disaffected to the Protector, they remained "firmly united one to another, and all of us to your Highnesse, as our Generall and Chief Magistrate." They made it their "earnest and humble request" that he would continue the work of settlement until they had attained "the great ends of all our former engagements, our civill and spirituall liberty." These ends, they were confident, were "already in a good measure well provided for, by *The Humble Petition and advice.*" They did "freely and heartily engage" to support the Protector with their lives in the "further prosecution of the great work" upon which he was engaged.³ It is plain from the contents of this petition and from the signatures attached to it that Cromwell had nothing to fear from his army; and this was Thurloe's conviction even before the address was presented.⁴ Equally reassuring were the addresses from the armies in Scotland and Ireland. The Irish army, in fact, went even further than the English in their pledges of allegiance to the Protector in his government.⁵

Nevertheless, the army was far from being satisfied throughout. Major Lowe, in Ireland, for instance, refused to sign the address of

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 16, 1657/8, Thurloe, VII. 4; *Mercurius Politicus*, March 17-24, 1657/8. See Oliver's speeches to the Mayor, etc., in Stainer, 398-401. Addresses of the Commissioners for the city militia and the Colonels of the train bands, in *Mercurius Politicus*, April 17-24, 1658.

² H. W. to —, March 25, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 144.

³ *A Further Narrative of the Passages of these times in the Common-Wealth of England*, printed by M. S. for Thomas Jenner, 50, 51. The date of the petition is March 27, 1658.

⁴ Thurloe to Lockhart, March $\frac{11}{21}$, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 863; to Downing, March $\frac{12}{22}$, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 871; to Lockhart, March $\frac{15}{23}$, 1657/8, *ibid.*, VII. 3; to H. Cromwell, March $\frac{16}{26}$, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 4.

⁵ See H. W.'s news-letter, March 25, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 143-145; officers of Colonel Wilks's and Colonel Fairfax's regiments, Dalkeith, February 27, 1657/8, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 406, pp. 373-374; officers of Colonel Talbot's and Lord General Monk's regiments, Dalkeith, March 3, 1657/8, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 115, p. 379; officers of Colonel Read's regiment, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 407, p. 384; officers of Colonel Mitchel's regiment, Dundee, March 8, 1657/8, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 116, p. 396; officers of Colonel Robert Lilburne's regiment, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 409, p. 415; "Officers of your Highness Army," presented by Lord Charles Fleetwood, March 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 419; officers of Colonel Ralph Cobbet's regiment, *Public Intelligencer*, No. 118, p. 415; Major-General Thomas Morgan and the commissioned officers of the forces in Flanders, April 4, 1658, *ibid.*, p. 428; garrison of Inverlochy, *Mercurius Politicus*, No. 410, p. 431; Major-General Morgan and regiment in Scotland, *ibid.*, No. 411, p. 455; Colonel Francis Hacker and regiment in Scotland, *ibid.*, p. 461; from the army in Ireland, *Public Intelligencer*, June 14-21, 1658, No. 130, p. 613.

the army there because a clause therein seemed to him clearly to urge kingly government.¹ The officers of Cromwell's own regiment, all Anabaptists, were most recalcitrant, and declared themselves not "free" to subscribe fully to the address of the English army. Cromwell reasoned with them, and finding them to assert steadfastly that they would adhere to "the good old cause," requested them to define that "cause," and to mention "one particular, wherein he had departed from it," at the same time telling them what he thought the cause was. Despite repeated requests for clearer declarations, however, the officers would not attempt any such definition. Only it was plain that the present government did not square with their conception of "the good old cause." The real difficulty, Colonel Packer afterwards declared, was their unwillingness to acknowledge the "other house"; "they could not say that was a House of Lords."² Failing to get satisfaction from them, Cromwell dismissed the six principal officers of the regiment,³ and having thus made a beginning, he continued to cashier ill-affected officers. All those "through the nation" who were "abettors of a late petition" for the Commonwealth were ousted.⁴ "Many in the army," says Baillie, "both in Scotland and England, are cast out."⁵ Clearly Oliver intended that no backward step should be taken. While the Protectorate stood, allegiance must be given to it, as well in the army as out of it. Not less obvious is it that all this cashiering tended to encourage the civil-government party and renew the hope that Cromwell would be king.

Kingship was probably now the only solution for the difficulties which beset the government, and it was generally expected. A new Parliament, it was said, would be called, but a Parliament including the old lords, and the Commons elected by the old constituencies.⁶ Whether the old lords were to be summoned or not

¹ H.-Cromwell to Thurloe, March 24, 1657/8, Thurloe, VII. 21. H. Cromwell promptly dismissed Lowe from the army. H. Cromwell to Colonel Cooper, May 19, 1658, *ibid.*, 142, 143.

² Burton, III. 165-166.

³ Thurloe to Monk, February 12, 1657/8, *Clarke Papers*, III. 140; to Lockhart, February ¹¹/₂₁ 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 793; and to H. Cromwell, February 16, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 806, 807, which gives the facts as here stated.

⁴ Wainwright to Bradshaw, February 19, 1657/8, *Sixth Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 442. Wainwright speaks again of further cashiering in a letter of March 5, *ibid.*

⁵ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

⁶ "You will have a Parliament called in short time of real Lords and Commons, according to the [—] will of the nation." Wainwright to Bradshaw, February 12, 1657/8, *Sixth Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission*, 442. Again on February 19, "shall have a Parliament once within nine months, called and constituted according to the ancient rights of the nation in the late King's time; . . . The ancient burroughs and cities their ancient number, and the Peers of the nation that have not forfeited their rights." *Ibid.*

it is impossible to say, but certainly the old unreformed system of elections to the Commons would prevail, since the Humble Petition and Advice had not adopted the reformed plan embodied in the Instrument. In any case Cromwell intended to have a new Parliament as soon as possible.

The question of calling a new Parliament came up immediately after the dissolution of the old one. Broghill wrote Henry Cromwell in February that another Parliament was in contemplation.¹ On February 23 Fleetwood wrote that Cromwell's illness was the reason for doing nothing at present.² On March 2 he again wrote that the question of settlement was being discussed, and that in his opinion they would "suddenly have a parliament." The question had been debated thoroughly. "All wayes" had "great difficultyes in them, but this the least, though full of intricacyes."³ It is plain that Fleetwood favored a Parliament, but that others in the council strongly opposed it. Indeed, the question was so far from being settled at this time that Fleetwood added a postscript to his letter saying that "since the wrighting of the former lines" it had become doubtful which way they would take. In brief, the struggle between monarchists and antimonarchists still went on. The antimonarchists were opposed to having a Parliament and wished to raise means for carrying on the government by laying an extraordinary tax upon the Cavaliers.⁴ Unquestionably Desborough was the leader of this faction,⁵ though he was certainly not supported by Fleetwood.⁶ Until March 30 the discussion, according to Thurloe, was "tossed up and downe amongst comitees of severall sorts" and then had "at last come to the councell." The exact position of parties is well described by him: "They inclyne to a parlament, if they can agree what to aske the parlament, and what to submitt to, that shall be done by them and his highnes." Thurloe would give no opinion "because I see what some persons enclyne to, and what they thinke of a parlament and of such a way of settlement, as a parlament (if well-minded) may bringe forth."⁷ Two weeks later he wrote in a similar strain. There could be no doubt that a Parliament would be decided upon immediately, but

¹ "I am glad there is any hopes of another parliament." H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 24, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 820.

² Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, February 23, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 817.

³ Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, March 2, [1657/8], *ibid.*, 840.

⁴ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 30, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 38.

⁵ H. Cromwell to Broghill, [February, 1658], *ibid.*, VI. 790; same to same, April 7, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 56.

⁶ Same to same, March 24, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 21, 22; Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 100; same to same, May 24, 1658, *ibid.*, 144.

⁷ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, March 30, 1658, *ibid.*, 38.

for "the feares in some honest men, that they will settle us upon some foundations: and the doubts of some other, that if those feares still prevayle, and soe disappoint a settlement, that then a parliament will ruin us."¹ Here in a sentence he revealed the entire situation. It was kingship or ruin, from the point of view of Thurloe and Broghill; it was kingship and ruin, from the point of view of Desborough and Sydenham. Hence, the calling of a Parliament was not to be rashly adventured. Some agreement between the pros and cons must first be attained. Significant, however, is the readiness of Cromwell and his royalist supporters to summon a new Parliament, for it showed clearly their confidence that such a body would be with them, and that public opinion supported the proposal of kingship.²

It is evident that the opponents of kingship feared that a Parliament would make Cromwell king, and were determined to obstruct by every means in their power the calling of a Parliament. Not only so, but they were bent on suppressing the monarchists as far as possible. They wished to exclude Montague from the council and to hinder Fauconberg from receiving a commission in the army.³ In these circumstances the only policy for the royalists was precisely similar, namely, that of purging the army and council of their opponents. Henry Cromwell and undoubtedly Broghill were anxious to have this policy carried through. The former wrote:

The calling of a parliament signifys nothing, untill the army be sufficiently modelled; for that being full of its humours makes the honest party timorous, and the other insolent in their respective proposalls; . . . I say, the well-framing of the army would insensibly temper, and keep steady the parliament, which no doubt would provide well enough for a councill. The policy of those, who would keep out honest Montagu, etc. is not to be disallowed. I must say, I commend them for their witt; but think withall, that the over-ballancing of these politicians themselves is to be endeavoured; . . . We have ebbd and flowd long enough already. 'Tis now time, as your lordship says, that affairs should run one way or other in a quick current, and, if God so please, to settlement. The intimacy you mention of Fleetwood and Disbrowe with Lambert I do not like; for when such as they dare correspond with such as hee, it argues their power to be greater than one would wish, though I

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 99.

² This confidence in Parliament is worth noting. It has often been said that Cromwell failed utterly with his Parliaments and could not get along with any. This was evidently not the opinion of Broghill, Thurloe, or Henry Cromwell. As the Parliament of 1656 had been more favorable to Oliver than that of 1654, so the next would probably be more favorable still. Much of this confidence was perhaps based on the fact that the next Parliament would be elected on the old basis. The result was seen in Richard's Parliament.

³ H. Cromwell to Broghill, March 10, 1657/8, Thurloe, VI. 858.

hope no greater then of all the rationall and interessed men of the 3 nations, who, I am confident, will not comply with their designs.¹

The army was the instrument which needed mending first of all; and that must be done by the Protector. As already seen, Oliver had proceeded to some extent in that direction, though Henry Cromwell wished a much more thorough purging. Next in importance was the reform of the council, but if the army was once put on a proper footing, no doubt Parliament would rectify aught that was amiss in the council. The antimonarchical members should be ejected and monarchists taken in. Montague, Broghill, Pierrepont, St. John — these Henry would have taken in; Sydenham, Desborough, Fleetwood — these Henry would have cast out. Meanwhile Lambert was again becoming a factor in politics, and Fleetwood and Desborough were coquetting with him. Action, immediate and decisive, was necessary. No more compromises. "We have ebbed and flowed long enough already."

The discussion over the calling of a Parliament was continued through the first half of April, and was participated in by a council of the army.² By April 20 the civil-government party had so far overcome their opponents that the calling of a Parliament had been resolved upon, though the date of its summons and the nature of the business to be laid before it were still undetermined.³ The struggle between the contending factions was to be waged about this latter subject — or in other words, over the proposal to allow Parliament to proceed to any settlement it pleased. Such a settlement would probably mean kingly government.

This was the general opinion, and it must be obvious that the failure of the last Parliament had strengthened the determination of the monarchists to make Cromwell king. As early as February 24 Henry Cromwell wrote to Broghill, "I trust his highness will bring the army to such a state, as that there may be no danger of them, whilst his friends in parliament are hammering out our settlement."⁴ Further letters of Henry's written in April and May leave no doubt that he and Broghill were still of the opinion that kingship could

¹ H. Cromwell to Broghill, March 10, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 858. See also H. Cromwell to Thurloe, March 10, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 857.

² "The Privie Councill of his Highnesse, and another Councill of the army have been this weeke in debate of great business of calling a Parliament (which it's thought will sitt in May next), and likewise of a more future and more absolute settlement, then the Petition and Advice doth hold forth." G. M.'s News-letter, April 3, 1658, *Clarke Papers*, III. 145.

³ "K is resolved on: but when uncertain." Fauconberg to H. Cromwell, April 20, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 85. On the same day Thurloe wrote that Parliament would probably be summoned "very shortly." *Ibid.*, 84.

⁴ H. Cromwell to Broghill, February 24, 1657/8, *ibid.*, 820.

be attained.¹ The Irish army, probably influenced by Henry, petitioned that the Protector should go on to make "a thorough settlement of these our enjoyments; and that, upon such a Basis, as may be most firm in itself, and most suitable to the constitution of these nations."² The last phrase obviously pointed to kingship as the desirable basis. In Baillie's opinion the addresses of the armies in both Scotland and England also encouraged "the Protector to proceed," and it was thought, he added, that "on the councill's act and armie's petition, the Crown shall be put on." "Sundry shyes" were also "said to be forming petitions to his Highness to accept of the title of King."³ Without doubt, many of those who signed the army petitions must have done so in the expectation that kingship would be the outcome. As to the shires, certain petitions did appear in July and August, asking for settlement, with an evident reference to kingship as the government "most natural and acceptable to the nation."⁴

The need of settlement—a settlement that would compel the obedience of those inclined to royalty—was ominously emphasized by the prominence among the conspirators in the plot of 1658 of many young royalists who had hitherto shown themselves well-affected to the Protector and his government.⁵ This was a grave and most significant fact; for this younger generation, which had taken no active part in the quarrels of the past, should have known no allegiance excepting that to the established government. It was otherwise, however, and largely because these young men found themselves excluded from all participation in public affairs because they were members of Cavalier families; partly, too, no doubt, because of the severity with which the government of the major-generals had handled the Cavaliers. It was necessary to have a settlement that should strike at the sources of this disaffection.

¹ April 7, 1658, *ibid.*, VII. 56; April 14, 1658, *ibid.*, 72; [May?], 1658, *ibid.*, 115.

² *Public Intelligencer*, June 14–21, 1658.

³ Baillie to Spang, [June, 1658], Baillie, III. 360.

⁴ "V. That in your Highness life time such provision be made for the future Government of the Commonwealth, as may secure the interest of the good people of these Nations for succeeding Generations, That they may call you Blessed." Petition to Oliver of justices of peace, etc., of Nottingham, July 23, 1658, *Public Intelligencer*, August 9–16, 1658.

"And that your Highness would be pleased to enlarge our hopes of the continuance and increase of our present happines, by the further settlement and practice of that Government amongst us, which hath been found most natural and acceptable to this Nation, and is such as (administered by good hands) will we doubt not very much tend to the tranquility and felicity of this Commonwealth, your Highness and posterity." Petition from the grand jurors of the county of York, *Mercurius Politicus*, August 12–19, 1658.

⁵ "And they have enticed many young gentlemen, that were never before of their party." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, April 27, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 99. See also H. Cromwell's remarks on the young Cavaliers. To Thurloe, June 30, 1658, *ibid.*, 218.

It is a question of prime importance to determine Cromwell's attitude towards the renewal of the project of kingship. Bernardi asserted positively that Cromwell designed to be king;¹ and the author of the *Second Narrative* remarks that it "is reported" that though Cromwell refused the kingship, he "hath since repented his then Refusal."² That either of these individuals spoke with authority cannot be pretended, but certainly Cromwell had had reason to regret "his then refusal," and since he had once with much less provocation determined to accept kingship, one is surely justified in inferring that now he would willingly have become king. Moreover, if Broghill was to be believed, Cromwell had certainly concluded to accept the monarchical form of government. "I hope," wrote Henry Cromwell, "his highnes brave resolutions not to be cozened again will beget a serenity in your lordship's intentions."³ And in May he hoped that "his highnes's . . . promises that he will ratify and prepare the army for due compliance, etc." would encourage Broghill not to retire.⁴ It is clear from these quotations and from the general tone of Henry's letters that Broghill had asserted that Cromwell would "prepare the army for due compliance," in other words, that he was ready to assist in establishing the new monarchy.

That Cromwell was willing to accept such a settlement is also inferable from Thurloe's letters, as will be seen. That such a willingness would be apparent to the antimonarchists and that it would aggravate their opposition to kingship is self-evident. They had attempted to prevent the calling of a Parliament, and despite the resolution taken by the council that a Parliament should be summoned, they were still capable of delaying indefinitely the meeting of that body. The leaders of the republican faction in the council hit upon a bold expedient to thwart the monarchists. This was no less than the reconciliation of Cromwell with the leaders of the old Long Parliament. It was suggested that to this end Vane, Ludlow, and Rich should be taken into the council. Of course this plan contemplated a considerable return to the system of the Commonwealth, for no one could believe that such irreconcilables as these would ever consent to the protectoral government, not to speak of kingship. That they had been approached is certain, and that it was the antimonarchists who wished to call them into the council is also certain.⁵ Nothing, however, came of this effort at reconciliation.

¹ Bernardi, March $\frac{21}{31}$, 1658, Prayer, 475.

² *Second Narrative, Harleian Miscellany* (edition of 1745), III. 462.

³ H. Cromwell to Broghill, April 14, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 72.

⁴ H. Cromwell to Broghill, [May ?], 1658, *ibid.*, 115.

⁵ "I am glad to hear of Ludlow, Rich, and also Sir Harry Vane's compliance," wrote Henry Cromwell. He doubted, however, the completeness of that compliance,

Progress in any direction seemed indeed to be impossible. "As for our owne affaires," wrote Thurloe, "they stand much at one staye : some discourses have beene this weeke about a settlement, and how to prepare for the comeinge of a parliament ; but I doe assure your excellency, that I cannot finde the mindes of men soe disposed, as may give the nation the hopes of such a settlement as is wish'd for ; and truly I thinke, that nothinge but some unexpected providence can remove the present difficulties."¹ This was on the first of June ; and two weeks later Fleetwood wrote that "farther considerations of what is necessary as previous to the parliament" had been had, but "no resolution" had yet been reached.² Despairing of ever getting the matter determined by the council, Cromwell now appointed a committee of nine to settle it.³ Of course it was necessary to place members of both factions on this committee, and Cromwell would certainly never have dreamed of constituting it otherwise. The antimonarchists, however, had a majority, though two of their number were lukewarm in opposition. When Henry Cromwell was informed of the constitution of this new body, he spoke with bitter scorn and contempt of the new body and of the effort to reach settlement through its mediation.⁴ His contempt was justified, for after several weeks of debate on the question of settlement the majority "voted that succession in the government was indifferent," it might well be either by election or hereditary. This colorless conclusion was, of course, satisfactory to no one ; and several of the antimonarchists insisted upon the

and added, "Neither do I think, that your affairs will gain much reputation by their being in your councill." He continues : "Is it not also a matter worth observation, who are the men, that are most industrious to call in such help ? May it not be a design to obstruct and clog the business, when no other way is left to hinder your settlement, or cover their own disaffection ? . . . He, that runs along with you, may more easily trip up the heels, than he, that wrestles with you ; but my jealousy is easily appeased, when you say his highness hath an opportunity in his hands to settle." H. Cromwell to Thurloe, June 2, 1658, *ibid.*, 154, 155.

¹ Thurloe to H. Cromwell, June 1, 1658, *ibid.*, 153.

² Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, June 15, 1658, *ibid.*, 176. Fleetwood expected Parliament to meet in September.

³ "There are 9 in number, who dayly meet for consideringe of what is fitt to be done in the next parliament. . . . The 9 are lord Fiennes, lord Fleetwood, lord Desbrow, lord Chamberlayne, lord Whalley, Mr. comptroller, lord Goffe, lord Cooper, and Your Excellency's

Most humble and faithfull servant

Jo. Thurloe."

Thurloe to H. Cromwell, June 22, 1658, *ibid.*, 192. See also Philips's remarks upon this juncto and Cromwell's balancing of parties on it, in his *Continuation of Baker's Chronicle* (ed. 1674), 652.

⁴ "The wise men were but 7. It seems you have made them 9 ; and having heard their names, I think myself better able to guess what they'll do, then a much wiser man ; for no very wise man can ever imagine it." H. Cromwell to Thurloe, June 30, 1658, Thurloe, VII. 218.

desirability of the elective method as specified in the Humble Petition and Advice, "that is, that the chiefe magistrate should alwayes name his successor, . . . and I feare the word *desirable* will be made necessary, if ever it come upon the tryall,"¹ complained Thurloe. The question of the succession was evidently still the kernel of the whole problem. Of course, if succession was to be hereditary, the protectorate was in all essentials a monarchy.

Cromwell's position is pretty clearly determinable by his reception of the committee's report. He discharged them from further consideration of the matter, and declared that he would "take his own resolutions," that he could no "longer satisfie hymselfe to sitt still, and make himselfe guilty of the losse of all the honest partye, and of the nation itselfe."² This was a decisive declaration in favor of the monarchists, as Thurloe evidently believed. Cromwell was apparently determined to act, and in the way they desired. Still the opposition waxed no fainter, and the egress from the political *cul-de-sac* was not found. "I doubt the thinge most to be feared," said Thurloe, "is, that some men, who oppose, and, I beleewe, will certainly disappoint such a settlement, which others can positively advise, doe not know what they would have; and it may be account it the best way to fix no where, but to fancye themselves in the condition of Israel in the wilderness, who knewe not overnight which way their journey was to lye the next morning. And truly," he adds, with acrid pleasantry, "I should rejoyce to be in this condition, if these gentlemen had as sure a guide as the Israelites."³ Only one thing was resolved upon—that a Parliament should be called as soon as possible. Undoubtedly to it would have to be remitted the solution of the problem of government.

All speculation and all further attempts were frustrated by the events of August and September, 1658. The illness of Lady Clay-

¹ "As I take it, the report was made to his highnesse upon thursday. After much consideration, the major part voted, that succession in the government was indifferent, wheither it were by election or hereditary; but afterwards some would needs add, that it was desirable to have it continued elective; that is, that the chiefe magistrate should alwayes name his successor, and that of hereditary avoyded, and I feare the word *desirable* will be made necessary, if ever it come upon the tryall." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, *ibid.*, 269.

² "I beleewe wee are out of the daunger of our junto, and I thinke alsoe of ever havinge such another. . . . His highnes, findeing he can have noe advice from those he most expected it from, sayth, he will take his owne resolutions, and that he cannot any longer satisfie hymselfe to sitt still, and make himselfe guilty of the losse of all the honest partye, and of the nation itselfe; and truly I have long wished, that his highnes would proceed accordinge to his owne satisfaction, and not soe much consider others, who truly are to be indulged in every thinge but where the beinge of the nation is concerned." Thurloe to H. Cromwell, July 13, 1658, *ibid.*, 269.

³ Same to same, July 27, 1658, *ibid.*, 295.

poole kept Cromwell from all business and put off the calling of Parliament, so that it could not possibly meet before October.¹ As a consequence, the Parliament never met. Oliver died on the third of September, and all hope of successfully settling the government, excepting in the Stuarts, was at an end. The question concerning kingship had created a permanent division in the Cromwellian ranks, a division which must result in open and irreconcilable hostility after Oliver's death, while the contending factions were so nearly balanced. Had he lived ten years longer, no doubt he would gradually have weeded out the troublesome officers in the army, reconstructed his council, accepted the royal office, and suppressed the republican opposition. The decisive and immediate action so much desired by his son Henry he certainly never would have taken; and he would have been right in not taking it. Such action might have led to an immediate insurrection and so have destroyed all prospect of settlement. Men who had held power so long could not consent to being shelved in this easy fashion. Besides, if not friends of the younger Cromwells, they were the men who had most assisted in the making of Oliver. The situation demanded patience, a quality always at Oliver's disposal and always exercised by him. Time was the essential requisite, and had this been granted, the line of Cromwell might well have supplanted that of Stuart. There was no popular demand for the restoration of Charles II. What was known of him in England was distinctly to his discredit, and few even of his own partizans had hopes of his return. Time, however, was not granted. At Oliver's death the position of parties was such that Richard Cromwell's protectorate could not possibly endure; and the only wonder is that he managed to hold his own for the space of nine months. Even this would have been impossible, had the opposing factions been resolved upon anything, had they not been in such a condition that they did "not knowe what they would have" and could "fix no where." When once they had reached a conclusion, Richard fell; and so far as the Puritan cause was concerned, all could say, as Oliver feared he might be compelled to say, "*Actum est de Anglia.*"

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

¹ "Thes late providences hath much retarded our publicke resolutions, that it will be October ere the parliament can sitt." Fleetwood to H. Cromwell, August 3, 1658, *ibid.*, 309.